Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation
Water Resources Division
Water Rights Bureau

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
For Routine Actions with Limited Environmental Impact

Part I. Proposed Action Description

1. *Applicant/Contact name and address:*

H & L Properties LLP
PO Box 249
Paradise, MT 59856-0249

Quinn's Canyon LLC
304 S Tracy Ave
Bozeman, MT 59715-4606

2. *Type of action*: Permit Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 76M 30117388

3. *Water source name:* Groundwater

4. *Location affected by project*: The place of use is generally located in the E2SW & W2SE, Sec 9, T18N, R25W, Sanders, MT

5. *Narrative summary of the proposed project, purpose, action to be taken, and benefits:*

The Applicant is requesting an additional 94 GPM up to 26.04 AF from two manifold wells, Public Water Supply (PWS) well #2 (GWIC No. 281392) and PWS well #3 (GWIC No. 285745), located in Govt Lot 9, SENESW, Section 9, Township 18N, Range 25W, Sanders County, Montana. The Applicant proposes to divert and use groundwater for commercial purposes January 1st thru December 31st. The DNRC shall issue a water use permit if an applicant proves the criteria in 85-2-311 MCA are met.

6. *Agencies consulted during preparation of the Environmental Assessment:*
(include agencies with overlapping jurisdiction)

-U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Montana Natural Heritage Program: Endangered, Threatened Species and Species of Special Concern, Wetland Mapper program
-Montana Department of Fish Wildlife & Parks (DFWP); Dewatered Stream Information
-Montana Department of Environmental Quality's (MDEQ) Clean Water Act Information and PWS Drinking Water Watch databases
-U.S. Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS); web soil survey
-Montana Historical Society

Part II. Environmental Review

1. Environmental Impact Checklist:

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

WATER QUANTITY, QUALITY AND DISTRIBUTION

Water quantity *- Assess whether the source of supply is identified as a chronically or periodically dewatered stream by DFWP. Assess whether the proposed use will worsen the already dewatered condition.*

The Applicant proposes to divert groundwater. Depletions to the Clark Fork River will occur. This stretch of the River is not chronically or periodically dewatered.

Determination: No impact.

Water quality *- Assess whether the stream is listed as water quality impaired or threatened by DEQ, and whether the proposed project will affect water quality.*

According to the Montana Department of Environmental Quality's (MDEQ) Clean Water Act Information Center in 2018 the Clark Fork River, Fish Creek to Flathead River was listed as having one or more uses impaired due to one or more of the following probable causes: copper, iron, lead, nitrogen (total), and phosphorous (total). Depletions to the Clark Fork from the proposed use will total 2.6 AF, approximately 1.6 GPM.

Determination: No impact.

Groundwater *- Assess if the proposed project impacts ground water quality or supply. If this is a groundwater appropriation, assess if it could impact adjacent surface water flows.*

The Applicant is requesting an additional 94 GPM up to 26.04 AF from two manifold wells, Public Water Supply (PWS) well #2 (GWIC No. 281392) and PWS well #3 (GWIC No. 285745). The source aquifer is an unconfined gravel and sand aquifer of the Clark Fork alluvium. Depletions to the Clark Fork from the proposed use will total 2.6 AF, approximately 1.6 GPM.

Determination: No impact

DIVERSION WORKS *- Assess whether the means of diversion, construction and operation of the appropriation works of the proposed project will impact any of the following: channel impacts, flow modifications, barriers, riparian areas, dams, well construction.*

The Applicant is requesting to divert an additional 94 GPM up to 26.04 AF from two manifold wells, PWS well #2 (GWIC No. 281392) and PWS well #3 (GWIC No. 285745). Each well was drilled by a licensed well driller (license # WWC-646 and # WWD-126) in accordance with Title 37, Chapter 43,

MCA and Title 36, Chapter 21, ARM. The Applicant is proposing to expand the resort and needs additional flow and volume from PWS well #2 and PWS well #3. Based on Larsen Engineering's water system design the expansion will require both well pumps to operate simultaneously for a peak instantaneous flow rate of 200 GPM. Currently, each well pump is permitted for 106 GPM and the wells do not operate simultaneously. In the future when both pumps are in operation the diverted flow rate will total 200 GPM (100 GPM from each well). The Applicant is requesting 94 GPM which is the difference between what it currently permitted (106 GPM) and what it needed post expansion (200 GPM).

Both wells will be equipped with a Goulds Model 95L submersible pump with submersible 7.5-hp motor. The pump is rated to produce 100 GPM at 208 feet of total dynamic head. Based on the supplied pump curve each pump is capable of producing 100 GPM.

The supply system consists of two wells, pump house, six pressure tanks, chlorine contact loop, three-inch and four-inch water mains and appurtenant valving and controls. The wells will run independently or simultaneously depending on demand and are controlled by the pressure in the water system.
The Department found that no significant negative impact will occur to existing water users and surface water resources from the proposed project.

Determination: No impact.

UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

Endangered and threatened species **-** *Assess whether the proposed project will impact any threatened or endangered fish, wildlife, plants or aquatic species or any "species of special concern," or create a barrier to the migration or movement of fish or wildlife. For groundwater, assess whether the proposed project, including impacts on adjacent surface flows, would impact any threatened or endangered species or "species of special concern."*

The Montana Natural Heritage Program website was reviewed to determine if there are any threatened or endangered fish, wildlife, plants or aquatic species or any "species of special concern" in Township 18N, Range 25W that could be impacted by the proposed project.

Plants:
The following six plant species were listed as species of concern: Sand Springbeauty (Claytonia arenicola), Cascade reedgrass (Calamagrostis tweedyi), Clustered Lady's-slipper (Cypripedium fasciculatum), Leucolepis umbrella moss (Leucolepis acanthoneuron), Syntrichia papillosissima, and A Lichen (Lobaria hallii).

Animals:
The Bull Trout (Salvelinus confluentus) is listed as threatened and the Westslope Cutthroat Trout (Oncorhynchus clarkia lewisi), Wolverine (Gulo gulo), Fisher (Martes pennanti), Peregrine Falcon (Falco peregrinus), and Coeur d'Alene Salamander (Plethodon idahoensis) are listed as sensitive species by the USFS. The Golden Eagle (Aquila chrysaetos), Hoary Bat (Lasiurus cinereus), Little Brown Myotis (Myotis lucifugus) and Smoky Taildropper (Prophyssaon humile) are listed S3 to S3B by MFWP meaning their populations are at risk because their numbers are very limited. This is a change

application; no change will occur to historic diverted or consumed volumes or flow rate. The timing of return flows to surface waters will not change. The place of use is not being expanded. The proposed project will not impact any threatened or endangered fish, wildlife, plants and aquatic species or any species of special concern.

Determination: No impact.

Wetlands - *Consult and assess whether the apparent wetland is a functional wetland (according to COE definitions), and whether the wetland resource would be impacted.*

Determination: N/A, project does not involve wetlands.

Ponds - *For ponds, consult and assess whether existing wildlife, waterfowl, or fisheries resources would be impacted.*

Determination: N/A, project does not involve ponds.

GEOLOGY/SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE - *Assess whether there will be degradation of soil quality, alteration of soil stability, or moisture content. Assess whether the soils are heavy in salts that could cause saline seep.*

According to soil survey data provided by the NRCS, soil within the place of use consists mostly of fine sandy loam and gravelly loam. Soils within the proposed place of use drain quickly and are not susceptible to saline seep. The beneficial uses associated with the place of use are not changing; the quantity of water diverted and consumed will not exceed historic practices.

Determination: No impact.

VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY/NOXIOUS WEEDS - *Assess impacts to existing vegetative cover. Assess whether the proposed project would result in the establishment or spread of noxious weeds.*

Any impacts to existing vegetation will be within the range of current disturbances due to current development.

Determination: No Impact.

AIR QUALITY - *Assess whether there will be a deterioration of air quality or adverse effects on vegetation due to increased air pollutants.*

No air pollutants were identified as resulting from the Applicants proposed use.

Determination: No impact.

HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES - *Assess whether there will be degradation of unique archeological or historical sites in the vicinity of the proposed project if it is on State or Federal Lands. If it is not on State or Federal Lands simply state NA-project not located on State or Federal Lands.*

This project is not located on state or federal land and therefore this section is not applicable.

Determination: No impact.

DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AND ENERGY - *Assess any other impacts on environmental resources of land, water and energy not already addressed.*

Determination: No impact.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS - *Assess whether the proposed project is inconsistent with any locally adopted environmental plans and goals.*

The project is located in an area with no locally adopted environmental plans.

Determination: No impact.

ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES - *Assess whether the proposed project will impact access to or the quality of recreational and wilderness activities.*

The proposed project will not inhibit, alter or impair access to present recreational opportunities in the area. The project is not expected to create any significant pollution, noise, or traffic congestion in the area that may alter the quality of recreational opportunities. The proposed place of use and diversion do not exist on land designated as wilderness.

Determination: No impact.

HUMAN HEALTH - *Assess whether the proposed project impacts human health.*

There should be no significant negative impact on human health from this proposed use.

Determination: No impact.

PRIVATE PROPERTY - *Assess whether there is any government regulatory impacts on private property rights.*
*Yes___ No_**x**__ If yes, analyze any alternatives considered that could reduce, minimize, or eliminate the regulation of private property rights.*

Determination: No impact.

OTHER HUMAN ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES - *For routine actions of limited environmental impact, the following may be addressed in a checklist fashion.*
Impacts on:

(a) *Cultural uniqueness and diversity?* None identified.

(b) *Local and state tax base and tax revenues?* None identified.

(c) *Existing land uses?* None identified.

(d) *Quantity and distribution of employment?* None identified.

(e) *Distribution and density of population and housing?* None identified.

(f) *Demands for government services?* None identified.

(g) *Industrial and commercial activity?* None identified.

(h) *Utilities?* None identified.

(i) *Transportation?* None identified.

(j) *Safety?* None identified.

(k) *Other appropriate social and economic circumstances?* None identified.

2. *Secondary and cumulative impacts on the physical environment and human population:*

Secondary Impacts: None identified.

Cumulative Impacts: None identified.

3. *Describe any mitigation/stipulation measures:* None

4. *Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, including the no action alternative, if an alternative is reasonably available and prudent to consider:*

No reasonable alternatives were identified in the EA.

PART III. Conclusion

1. Preferred Alternative: None identified.

2 Comments and Responses: None

4. *Finding:*
Yes___ No_X__ Based on the significance criteria evaluated in this EA, is an EIS required?

If an EIS is not required, explain <u>why</u> the EA is the appropriate level of analysis for this proposed action:

An EA is the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed action because no significant impacts were identified.

Name of person(s) responsible for preparation of EA:

Name: Melissa Brickl
Title: Hydrologist/Water Resource Specialist
Date: December 10, 2018